

REMARKS

Claims 2, 4, 10, 11, 15 and 18 are objected to because of the use of language referring to message types. The applicants submit that these claims are not indefinite since in the field of communications the concept of a message type is well known. For example, a particular message's type refers to the more general class of messages to which this particular message belongs or with which it can be identified. Claim 8 provides but one example of different message types. Thus, reconsideration of these objections is requested by the applicants.

Claims 2-4, 7, 10, 11, 15, 16 and 21-22 are regarded as allowable if properly rewritten. Claims 1, 8, 9, 14, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosen (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 20040171400) in view of Ericsson (U.S. Patent Number 6,223,047); claims 5, 12 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosen in view of Ericsson and Diachina (U.S. Patent Number 5,655,215); claims 6 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosen in view of Ericsson, Diachina, and Newton; and claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosen in view of Ericsson and Grille. Respectfully disagreeing with these rejections, reconsideration is requested by the applicants.

Independent claims 1, 9, 14 and 18 stand rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosen in view of Ericsson. All of these claims recite receiving / transmitting **an indication of what groups of messages will be transmitted**. The Examiner indicates on page 5 of the present office action that Rosen does not teach receiving an indication of what groups of messages will be transmitted. (The applicants submit that Rosen likewise does not teach transmitting an indication of what groups of messages will be transmitted.) Instead, the Examiner asserts that Ericsson provides this teaching, citing portions from column 8 of Ericsson. However, the applicants submit that the "two bits" of Ericsson (highlighted by the Examiner on page 6 of the present office action) are used to indicate the message type of **the particular message being received**. (See also Ericsson FIGs. 1, 2 and 4 which illustrate some of the message

types of Ericsson.) In contrast, the claims recite receiving / transmitting an indication of what groups of messages will be transmitted.

The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Rosen by transmitting in the beginning of the paging slot a multiple bit indicator according to Ericsson. However, the applicants assert that the Examiner has failed to provide sufficient support in the prior art for this statement. The Examiner has cited Ericsson col. 8, lines 47-49; however, the statement cited merely restates the gist / benefit of the Ericsson approach of indicating the message type in each message being received. It does not teach or suggest receiving / transmitting an indication of what groups of messages will be transmitted, nor does it provide any particular motivation for application to the F-QPCH of Rosen [0104], relied on by the Examiner. Moreover, the applicants submit that it is not clear how the Ericsson approach can be combined with the F-QPCH of Rosen in a workable manner.

Since none of the references cited, either independently or in combination, teach all of the limitations of independent claims 1, 9, 14 or 18, or therefore, all the limitations of their respective dependent claims, it is asserted that neither anticipation nor a prima facie case for obviousness has been shown. No remaining grounds for rejection or objection being given, the claims in their present form are asserted to be patentable over the prior art of record and in condition for allowance. Therefore, allowance and issuance of this case is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned, if such communication would advance the prosecution of the present application. Lastly, please charge any additional fees (including extension of time fees) or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 502117 – Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,
V. Oprescu-Surcobe et al.

By: _____

Jeffrey K. Jacobs
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 44,798
Phone No.: 847/576-5562
Fax No.: 847/576-3750